



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/676,572	09/30/2003	Stuart D. Cheshire	APL-P3153	7890
63096 7590 06/28/2010 PVF -- APPLE INC. c/o PARK, VAUGHAN & FLEMING LLP 2820 FIFTH STREET DAVIS, CA 95618-7759				
EXAMINER				
HAMZA, FARUK				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2455				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
06/28/2010		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/676,572

Applicant(s)

CHESHIRE, STUART D.

Examiner

FARUK HAMZA

Art Unit

2455

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 April 2010.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 5-9, 13-16, 21-24, 35-37 and 41-43 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 8, 9, 16, 17, 24, 35-37 and 41-43 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 5-7, 13-15, 21-23 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

Response to Amendment

1. Applicant's election without traverse of species I (claims 1, 5-8, 9, 13-16, 21-24, 35-37 and 41-43 in the reply filed on April 08, 2010 is acknowledged. Claim 40 has been canceled. Claims 1, 5-8, 9, 13-16, 21-24, 35-37 and 41-43 are pending.
2. The applicant should always use the period for response to thoroughly and very closely proof read and review the whole of the application for correct correlation between reference numerals in the textual portion of the Specification and Drawings along with any minor spelling errors, general typographical errors, accuracy, assurance of proper use for Trademarks TM, and other legal symbols ®, where required, and clarity of meaning in the Specification, Drawings, and specifically the claims (i.e., provide proper antecedent basis for "the" and "said" within each claim). Minor typographical errors could render a Patent unenforceable and so the applicant is strongly encouraged to aid in this endeavor.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 1, 5-8, 9, 13-16, 21-24, 35-37 and 41-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

As to claim 1, it recites "a second client" in line 3. There is no claim limitation of "a first client".

As to claim 1, it recites "a multicast response" in line 5. It also recites "a multicasted response" in line 8. It is unclear to the examiner whether these are referring to the same multicast response.

Claim 1 recites the limitation "the multicast query" in line 5. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claims 9 and 17 also have same deficiency. All the dependent claims have same deficiency of their base claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1, 8, 9, 16-17, 24, 35-37 and 41-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jonsson et al. (U.S. Patent Number 7,164,885) hereinafter referred as Jonsson and in view of Lumsden (US Pub. No 2003/0026410) hereinafter referred as Lumsden.

As to claim 1, Jonsson teaches a method for invalidating a resource record in a local cache at a client computer system within a network, comprising:
receiving a message from a second client querying a device; locating a second resource record associated with the second device; waiting for a

response to the multicast query; and if after a pre-determined number of queries the response to the query is not received in the pre-determined amount of time, invalidating the second resource record (Column 8, lines 1-Column 9, lines 8).

Jonsson does not explicitly teach the claim limitation of multicast message.

However, Lumsden teaches the claim limitation of multicast message (P[0019]).

It would have been obvious to the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the system of Jonsson by incorporating Lumsden's teaching of multicast message. Motivation to do so comes from the knowledge well known in the art that multicast deliver information to a group of destinations simultaneously using the most efficient strategy to deliver the messages over each link of the network only once, creating copies only when the links to the multiple destinations split.

As to claim 8, Jonsson teaches the method of claim 41, wherein the resource records are retrieved and the queries are issued at a pre-specified time interval (Column 8, lines 15-50).

As to claim 35, Jasson teaches the method of claim 1 wherein invalidating the resource record further comprises invalidating a child resource record of the resource record (Column 9, lines 9-22).

As to claim 41, Jasson teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the method further comprises: retrieving a resource record from the local cache at the client

computer system; issuing one or more queries for the resource record at the client computer system; waiting for a response to the query at the client computer system; and if the response to the query is not received in a pre-determined amount of time and after issuing a predetermined number of queries for the resource record, invalidating the resource record at the client computer system (Column 8, lines 51-Column 9, lines 8).

Claims 9, 16-17, 24, 36-37 and 42-43 do not teach or define any new limitation other than above claims 1, 8, 35 and 41. Therefore, claims 9, 16-17, 24, 36-37 and 42-43 are rejected for similar reasons.

Examiner's Note: Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers in the references as applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings of the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant in preparing responses, to fully consider the references in its entirety as potentially teaching of all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context.

Allowable Subject Matter

5. Claims 5-7, 13-15, 21-23 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Faruk Hamza whose telephone number is 571-272-7969. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Saleh Najjar can be reached at 571-272-4006. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 886-217-9197 (toll –free).

Faruk Hamza

Patent Examiner

Group Art Unite 2455

/Faruk Hamza/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2455